

R 111653Z AUG 08  
FM SECSTATE WASHDC  
TO AMEMBASSY BERLIN  
AMEMBASSY CANBERRA  
AMEMBASSY LONDON  
AMEMBASSY PARIS  
AMEMBASSY TOKYO

CONFIDENTIAL STATE 085940

PARIS FOR EST:H. SMITH

E.O. 12958: DECL: 08/31/2033  
TAGS: [MTCRE](#) [ETTC](#) [KSCA](#) [PARM](#) [PREL](#) [AU](#) [FR](#) [GM](#) [JA](#) [UK](#)

SUBJECT: MISSILE TECHNOLOGY CONTROL REGIME (MTCR) -- NEXT STEPS FOR SMALL GROUP PROPOSALS FOR 2008 (C)

REF: A. STATE 26726  
    [B.](#) STATE 44438  
    [C.](#) STATE 67437

Classified By: ISN/MTR Director Pam Durham.  
Reason: 1.4 (B), (D), (H).

[11.](#) (U) This is an action request. Embassies Berlin, Canberra, London, Paris, and Tokyo, please see paragraph 2.

[12.](#) (C) BACKGROUND/ACTION REQUEST: Per Ref C, the U.S. circulated to MTCR small group members in June a suggested proposal on Missile Technology Control Regime (MTCR) outreach to non-MTCR countries and requested feedback. We have reviewed the input received and now want to circulate a revised proposal. Embassies Berlin, Canberra, London, Paris, and Tokyo therefore are requested to deliver the paper in paragraph 3 below to appropriate host government officials and report any response. Posts should urge host governments to provide feedback back by no later than August 29, 2008.

[13.](#) (C) BEGIN TEXT OF NON-PAPER:

(CONFIDENTIAL/REL Australia, France, Germany, Japan, and the United Kingdom)

The United States greatly appreciates the helpful feedback we received from MTCR small group members on the draft proposal we circulated in June on outreach to non-MTCR countries. We have incorporated the various inputs and would appreciate your reviewing the proposal again before we circulate to more broadly to the MTCR Partners.

As context for your review of the revised draft proposal, we would like to provide the following additional information and clarifications:

--We would intend this proposal to supplement, not replace, existing MTCR outreach activities, including Partners' national and regional outreach.

--We also see this proposed outreach activity as separate and distinct from the seminar on risk assessment in licensing that Germany is organizing for 2009.

--We view this proposed meeting at the conclusion of the 2009 RPOC as an opportunity to reach a broader audience and potentially to involve more MTCR Partner countries than normally are included in outreach by the Chair or bilaterally by Partners.

--Partners would be able to decide on a national basis who would represent them at this meeting with non-Partners but we would expect that delegations would include technical as well as policy officials.

--France has indicated that if the U.S. proposal were adopted at the Canberra Plenary, France would be prepared to

organize the outreach meeting at the conclusion of the 2009 MTCR RPOC meeting. Invitations could be made by the POC to non-Partner countries via their embassies in Paris.

--The U.S. does not intend this proposal to create an "observer status" for the MTCR's Technical Experts Meeting (TEM).

--The MTCR would need to be clear that being invited to this outreach meeting does not convey any special status vis--vis the MTCR nor is it a signal about their prospects for Regime membership.

--The MTCR would need to evaluate the results of the 2009 meeting with non-Partners and decide whether to hold another meeting in 2010.

We would appreciate your review and any feedback on the revised proposal by August 29, 2008.

In keeping with past practice, if this suggested initiative is agreed by small group members, the U.S. would then move quickly to preview the proposal with Brazil, Russia, and South Africa. After the expiration of an appropriate comment period with Brazil, Russia, and South Africa, we would plan to submit the proposal formally to all MTCR Partners via the MTCR POC by September 15.

Revised U.S. Proposal on Regime Outreach for Small Group Consideration:

//////////  
//////////

At the 2007 Athens MTCR Plenary, the MTCR Partners acknowledged the growing risk of proliferation of weapons of mass destruction (WMD) and their means of delivery. Additionally, as noted in the Athens press release, they welcomed the growing awareness of the need for export controls and the expressed interest by many states in cooperating with the MTCR. They also confirmed their intention individually and through the outreach activities of the Chair to consult and cooperate with non-members to promote effective export controls over missiles and missile technology. In particular, they agreed:

" . . . that the MTCR Chair, assisted by the TEM Chair, as appropriate, will inform, following Plenary decisions, non-member states, as well as the 1540 Committee, of changes to the Guidelines and Annex for their information and use with a view to facilitating the widest possible application of the latest versions of these instruments and enabling interested non-member states to harmonize their controls with those of MTCR Partners. Contacts with non-member states may also include information on the rationale for changes to the Annex, while respecting the principle of confidentiality within the MTCR."

The United States strongly supports the MTCR Partners' commitment to outreach and cooperation with non-members on missile nonproliferation issues. We believe that in view of the ongoing global missile proliferation threat, MTCR Partners need to work side-by-side with non-Partners to actively encourage their support for the Regime's missile nonproliferation efforts, including by implementing the MTCR Guidelines and Annex on a national basis.

Accordingly, we think the Regime should build on the decision taken at the Athens Plenary to promote the widest possible application of MTCR controls by creating a specific opportunity to explain to interested non-member countries the rationale for changes made to the MTCR Guidelines and Annex. In particular, we believe it would be extremely valuable for the Regime to hold a meeting for representatives of interested non-Partner countries immediately following the conclusion of the MTCR Reinforced Point of Contact (RPOC) in Paris. The purpose of this meeting would be to brief interested non-Partners on any changes to the MTCR Guidelines

and Annex agreed at the previous MTCR Plenary, including by explaining why the changes were made, what they entail from a technical perspective, and the potential impact on licensing reviews.

If such a meeting were held following the 2009 MTCR RPOC meeting in Paris, the main agenda item would be any changes agreed to the MTCR Guidelines and Annex at the 2008 Canberra Plenary. Of course, other questions, including changes from previous years, also could be entertained.

Holding such an outreach activity immediately following the RPOC would be a way to increase MTCR Partner participation in Regime outreach activities and an opportunity for Partners to reach a broader audience. This meeting could include experts from all MTCR countries, as well as the MTCR Chair and the TEM Chair, and would be a way to complement outreach activities undertaken by the MTCR and by the MTCR Partners on a national and regional basis.

If Partners agree to host such an outreach event, the French POC could organize the meeting to take place immediately following the 2009 MTCR RPOC meeting in Paris. Additionally, the Partners could consider inviting to this meeting the countries that have membership applications pending with the Regime and the non-Partner countries that have been agreed as possible destinations for MTCR outreach visits at the 2007 Athens Plenary and the 2008 Canberra Plenary.

At the 2009 MTCR Plenary, we would expect the Partners to evaluate the results of this outreach meeting, and then decide whether to hold another meeting in 2010 and whom to invite.

END TEXT OF PAPER.

14. (U) POINT OF CONTACT: Please contact ISN/MTR Director Pam Durham with any questions or follow-up related to this issue (202-647-4931; durhampk@state.sgov.gov).

15. (U) Please slug any reporting on this or other MTCR-related issues for ISN/MTR.

RICE

NNNN

End Cable Text